DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 300 CE 002 360

AUTHOR	Perryman, Bruce C.
TITLE	Academic Education Will Not Get It!
INSTITUTION	Mountain-Plains Education and Economic Development Program, Inc., Glasgow AFB, Mont.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	11p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Educational Development; Educational Needs; *Educational Strategies; Government Role; *Manpower Development; Program Administration; *Program Development; Speeches; Systems Development; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Two equally important and parallel developments have been working together: first, the emergence of a substantial and well-defined national role in career education and second, the explosive expansion of the system of career education. Career education first should provide meaningful, practical, open-ended career education in communities and regions and in other eligible institutions (profit and nonprofit) of education. Second, it should provide an effective strategy for marshalling the myriad of manpower programs that have been uncovered throughout the national government. To begin to implement innovations in career education for the 1970's, a two-edged approach is needed: the creation of a system-wide career education coordinator and the establishment of a new organizational unit. The career education system should stimulate enrollment in all performance-measured educational activity in our educational system, particularly those that follow through with job and community placement. (Author/MW)

ED 098300

Mountain-Plains Education & Economic Development Program, Inc.

POST OFFICE BOX 3078 · GLASGOW, MONTANA 59231 · TEL: (406) 524-6221

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACADEMIC EDUCATION WILL NOT GET IT !

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By: Bruce C. Perryman
~~Deputy~~ Director~~/Vice President~~
Mountain-Plains Education and Economic Development Program, Inc.

January, 1973

CE 002 360

ACADEMIC EDUCATION WILL NOT GET IT!

Prepared by: Bruce C. Perryman, Deputy Director/Vice President, Mountain-Plains Education & Economic Development Program, Inc.

We are now well into the first years of a new decade. When it ends in a few more years, what will prove to have been the most important development in education in this decade?

Underlying all developments is a new awareness of the right to education -- an acknowledgment of the long denial of education to many and the determination that the right to it shall become reality. As this awareness grows, our society's expectation for education and the aspirations of families for their family members also grows.

One measurable result of all this has, of course, been the dramatic increase in interest in education.

Another result, not so measurable, of our growing awareness of the right to education and our rising expectations for it is the attention being given to opening the door to career education -- opportunities for the disadvantaged -- opportunities for families -- an effort that is beginning to tap a large, practically untouched reservoir of potential students.

So far, this effort is only beginning to tap this reservoir. In future years, career education is going to have to be even more open, available to all who want it and can profit by it. The educational institutions will certainly be important channels through which increased access to career education can be provided, whether a person seeks only a short-term, work-oriented education or whether he seeks the first years of his so called "college program".

Pressing the expansion of career education along with these more personal considerations, is society's ever-growing need for education manpower.

What we have done to provide the right opportunities, in the right places and at the right time, in order to satisfy the expanding demands on education -- together with the fact that we have come to see that even more will be necessary to satisfy them -- is in the author's opinion the most important development in career education over this next decade now going on.

Actually, historically, the author thinks we will come to see two equally important and parallel developments as having worked together:

First, the emergence of a substantial and well-defined national role in career education.

Secondly, the explosive expansion of the system of career education.

Let us examine these individually.

The author will not take time with a step-by-step review of all the national programs that were put into place in support of education in the sixties. Rather, let us sum up the major educational themes of this national interest in education.

The national commitment has meant a rapid movement: (1) toward strengthening education's capacity to serve national missions, (2) toward support of both public and private institutions (profit and non-profit) promoting diversity and autonomy, (3) toward providing equal opportunity to every citizen for as much education as would profit him, (4) toward non-partisan support for education, (5) toward increased support for vocational education.

At the same time that these forces were influencing education in general, various components of the educational system were compiling an enviable record.

Again, we will not take time with a step-by-step review. The single fact that the number of post-secondary community institutions doubled over the past decade to about one thousand with their enrollment tripling in the same period speaks eloquently enough.

More telling than mere numbers are some of the things done toward meeting the obligations plainly felt so needed: (1) the development of innovative programs to meet the needs of not only youth, but for adults seeking to up-grade themselves in their employment or simply to enrich their cultural life. (2) the superb access in enlisting local support for local endeavors. (3) the involvement in community service of all kinds. This involvement demonstrates that we recognize educational community relationships are not a one-way street, that we owe the community something for the support it has given us.

So the question now arises; has the national government done all it can or should to support education? And is everything organized on the career education scene? It must be answered "no" to both questions. More important, we would have to answer "no" if we were to put the two questions together and ask whether national support of career education is enough -- wide enough, deep enough, good enough -- to help these educational agencies obtain the goals we all share, particularly the goals of full opportunity and quality education for the poor -- whether they be white, black, brown, Mexican-American or American Indian.

Why is career education so widely regarded as "the people's education" when in reality it is failing to meet the needs of so many people who need help? The answer to this question is suggested in the title of these remarks: "Academic Education will not get it".

In explaining this, let us first recall a statement that former secretary Finch made in a speech in 1969. The former Secretary said,

> "One set of trends that particularly concerns me lies in the imbalance of the labor market. Ironically, unemployment is not the biggest single factor that is contributing to poverty in this nation. The majority of those millions classified as poor live in households in which the father and mother both work and one of them full-time. We thus face major problems with the discouraged worker who is expected to work full-time, at lower wages, with little or no chance for advancement."

What makes the Secretary's statement particularly excruciating is that while millions of these discouraged workers drag out their lives in dismal drudgery, jobs in nearly every field of employment that would lead to challenging and fruitful careers are going begging for lack of educated people -- people whom the emerging career education system is in a perfect position to reach.

Too many educators boast only of the number of their students who go on to finish four years of academic higher education. Not enough boast of their accomplishments in the more homely enterprise of preparing families, adults, youngsters -- or oldsters for that matter -- to enter immediately into a productive and meaningful career and life.

It may sound overly harsh to say that our colleges are not meeting the needs of people, and consequently, the need of the nation for their services. It is not meant to sound harsh. It is meant only to state the inescapable fact

that these needs are not being met although not necessarily through any unwillingness on the part of many educators. It is thought most of us would be only too willing to put a lot more into meeting these needs if we had more help.

Our studies indicate that nationwide about 40% of the costs of post-secondary public educational institutions are met by local taxes. This is admirable. It also suggests the need for more support from other sources -- private, state, and federal.

Now National legislation is aimed exclusively at support of community colleges. Even in the absence of any statutory requirements, the U. S. Office of Education has made a special effort to support the post-secondary education cause wherever a program can be made to fit this effort.

You may be sure it has been thought of in Washington. One of the first things Dr. Sid Marland did after his appointment was to set up a unit attached directly to his own office to (1) serve as a point of contact for career education people, (2) review all federal programs that might be directed for the support of career education to determine whether the potential of those programs could be fully realized and (3) work on some legislative proposals in the career education field.

This effort has been hard at work the past three years. Finally after innumerable consultations with many educators and with other agencies of the government, the effort developed a legislative proposal which created the National Institute of Education who, in turn, administers the thrust now on-going in the United States in career education.

It is planned to consult with many other educators further to improve the proposal of career education. In fact, meetings are scheduled within the next three months for this purpose.

One meeting will be under the auspices of the National Council of Vocational Education, the other under the auspices of the National Institute of Education and the U.S.O.E. It must be cautioned that even after they have obtained input at these meetings and have forwarded the proposal, it will still be subject to further change, indeed, discussions are still going on within the administration among educators, among business and industry, as to how best the federal government can serve the educational needs of the nation.

The National Institute of Education plans to involve the present on-going four career education models. Nevertheless, neither the Office of Education's effort or the total National effort is anywhere near what it should be.

Career education first should provide meaningful, practical open-ended career education in communities and regions and as well in other eligible institutions (profit and non-profit) of education. By career education, it is meant a system of instruction designed to prepare students for entry into, and advancement in, sub-professional, paraprofessional, managerial, and professional positions in such fields as engineering, technology, public services, medical technology, medicine, business, law, auto repair, plumbing, etc.

Second, to provide an effective strategy for marshalling the myriad of Manpower Programs that have been uncovered throughout the National Government. Many of them outside the Office of Education. Substantial funds should be directed through Career Education to those public schools, Community Colleges, non-profit agencies, and others that choose to take up the challenge of the career education system.

Proposed legislation encourages and authorizes the establishment, development, and improvement of a Career Education system by encouraging state planning and by instituting exemplary career education programs.

The importance attached to planning in Career Education--and Assistant Secretary Marland's apparent commitment to it--cannot be overemphasized.

To begin with, Career Education would encourage states and institutions to maintain contact with the representative of public and private agencies and organizations concerned with the development of the career education system.

The principle person or persons charged with operating or planning responsibilities for Career Education might possibly be the school board chairman or members thereof, but such decisions would be left to the various organizational entities.

The board would be responsible for formulating a plan for career education. There after, it would review proposals for exemplary programs submitted by its employees and constituents.

Given the scarcity of funds at present, it is still being debated whether the National government would fund planning or whether this cost would be

absorbed by the various agencies. There is no question however, that projects and individual institutions should receive support.

Our definition of Career Education for purposes of this discussion includes public and non-profit private agencies, technical institutes, two year programs offered by four year colleges and two year branches of universities located in the cities away from their parent institutions, and four year colleges and universities. In its present form, Career Education would also include proprietary institutions.

High priority among Career Education components would be assigned to: World of Work attitude development; destruction of the "academic" - "vocational" dicotomy - into one unified system of career education; curriculum development; outreach programs to encourage enrollment and placement; hiring and educating staff for guidance, counseling, and job placement; hiring and educating a faculty; arrangements with industry for cooperative education programs and curriculum enrichment, utilizing industry and community personnel as instructors; LAPs (learning activity packages), continuous progress methods, individualized instruction, open-entry, open-exit; vertical-horizontal curriculum integration; and non-gradedness.

Also encouraged would be cooperative arrangements with feeder organizations as well as four year colleges to strengthen educational programs for the development of effective career ladders.

As this author looks into the seventies and beyond resolving his thinking about the proper role of the government in support of Career Education many problems are under debate. Should government support be in the form of

student financial aide or institutional aide? One thing among all things is clear. That is that the opening of new career opportunities is essential and that to repeat the career education system emerging is the ideal vehicle for this. To begin to implement our ideas for career education, the inovators are making a two edged approach: First, and without waiting for legislation to be enacted, plans are being made to appoint as soon as possible a person to coordinate the overall thrust for career education on their own staff. This office will be the key point for information and coordination of career education system-wide. The list of programs in the system alone which participation could be greater is reason enough to begin immediately.

The role of this new office will be both that of innovator and coordinator.

The author wants it made very clear that he is not recommending setting up this office as a means of insulating career education from the rest of the system and its problems. It is his honest wish to keep communication, coordination and integration between all staff always open.

The other edge to our approach is this:

In implementing the career education system there should be a plan to establish a new organizational unit. In the new unit as well as in other units of the system, the program areas concerning the system should be staffed with career education experts. Additionally, the author recommends plans to establish immediately an advisory council on career education. Additional consultation with many groups in developing criteria and evaluation procedures for plans or proposals is needed.

Many readers are silently saying to themselves all of this is very fine, but asking too, how much money the government (state, local and national)

will put into it. For the first of your thoughts it is appreciated. In response to the second it can only be said that the answer will be influenced by changes in economic picture and of by how successful the government is in its efforts to curb the inflation and achieve a just peace.

If the government is successful in these two efforts -- and the author thinks it will be -- then career education should be in a good position to compete for additional funds when they become available.

One final point to emphasize.

In drafting plans we should have no thought whatever of strengthening this area of education at the expenses of any other. This is a system-wide approach. We are talking about redirected money and a modest amount of new money, not money siphoned off from other programs. Some vocational educators, for example, have expressed fear that this plan threatens them. This simply is not the case because the career education system should stimulate enrollment in all performance measured educational activity in our educational system, particularly those that follow through with job and community placement.

Nevertheless, it is thought that there is something special about the Career Education system and we look for it to out-do in the future the magnificant job it has just begun in the recent past in bringing education to those who suffer most from the lack of it -- at all age levels; both those now in school and those now out of school.